1	PAGES 1 - 18
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER, JUDGE
4	TIMOTHY DUFOUR AND KENNETH TANNER, INDIVIDUALS, ON THEIR OWN
5	BEHALVES AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,
6	PLAINTIFFS,
7	VS. NO. C 09-03770 CRB BE., LLC, DYNAMIC SHOWCASES,
8	LLC, CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES, MONTEREY FINANCIAL
9	SERVICES, INC., MTS HOLDINGS GROUP, INC., CALIFORNIA CORPORATIONS,
10	1901 CO., A NEVADA CORPORATION, BE MARKETING LIMITED, A PRIVATE LIMITED
11	COMPANY REGISTERED IN ENGLAND AND WALES, ERIK DESANDO, BARRY FLACK, JACOB STEINBECK,
12	VITALY RASHKOVAN, AND DOES 1-100, INCLUSIVE,
13 14	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA DEFENDANTS. FRIDAY FEBRUARY 25, 2011
15	10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	APPEARANCES:
18	FOR PLAINTIFFS: PRESTON LAW OFFICES (BY PHONE) 21001 NORTH TATUM BLVD.
19	SUITE 1630-430 PHOENIX, AZ. 85050
20	866-509-1197 BY: ETHAN MARK PRESTON, ESQUIRE
21	FURTHER APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE REPORTED BY: KATHERINE WYATT, CSR 9866, RMR, RPR
22	OFFICIAL REPORTER - US DISTRICT COURT COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION BY ECLIPSE
23	COM CIDADED INCOME HOLD DE LODI DE
24	
25	

1	FURTHER APPEARANCES:
2	ALSO FOR PLAINTIFFS:
3	BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER & BIRKHAEUSER
4	2125 OAK GROVE ROAD, SUITE 120
5	WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94598
6	925-945-8792
7	BY: MICHAEL S. STRIMLING, ESQUIRE
8	
9	FOR THE DEFENDANT MONTEREY FINANCIAL SERVICES:
10	CALL & JENSEN
11	610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
12	SUITE 700
13	NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660
14	BY: MATTHEW R. ORR, ESQUIRE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

10:00 O'CLOCK A.M. 1 FEBRUARY 25, 2011 2 3 PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: CALLING CASE C 09-3770, TIMOTHY DUFOUR 4 5 VERSUS BE, LLC. 6 APPEARANCES, COUNSEL. MR. ORR: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. MATTHEW ORR ON 7 BEHALF OF DEFENDANT MONTEREY FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. 8 9 MR. STRIMLING: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. MICHAEL 10 STRIMLING FOR PLAINTIFFS. 11 AND I BELIEVE ETHAN PRESTON IS ALSO ON THE TELEPHONE. 12 THE COURT: OKAY. 13 THE CLERK: COUNSEL, PLEASE MAKE YOUR APPEARANCE. MR. PRESTON (BY PHONE): THIS IS ETHAN PRESTON ON 14 15 BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS, THE DUFOURS AND KENNETH TANNER. THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. 16 17 WELL, THIS IS A MOTION TO DISMISS THE SECOND-AMENDED COMPLAINT. AND I HAD SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT IT I WANTED TO ASK. 18 19 THIS IS AGAINST MONTEREY. MONTEREY IS A DEBT COLLECTOR. 20 MR. STRIMLING: YOUR HONOR, THEY WERE MUCH MORE 21 22 INTIMATELY INVOLVED THAN THAT. THEY WOULD HELP SET UP THE 23 SYSTEMS. THEY SUPPLIED THE CONTRACTS THAT WERE SIGNED. THEY 24 WERE MUCH MORE INVOLVED AS THE SECOND-AMENDED COMPLAINT ALLEGES. 25 THE COURT: WELL, I SORT OF TRIED TO LOOK AT IT

```
1
      FROM -- I KNOW THIS ISN'T QUITE THE ORTHODOX WAY OF LOOKING AT
 2
      IT, BUT THEY ARE AT THE VERY LEAST A DEBT COLLECTOR.
 3
                 MR. STRIMLING: YES, YOUR HONOR, AT THE VERY LEAST.
                 THE COURT: AND THE OUESTION IS: AS A DEBT COLLECTOR
 4
 5
      UNDER THE ROSENTHAL ACT HAVE THEY RUN AFOUL OF THAT,
      ESSENTIALLY?
 6
 7
                MR. STRIMLING: RIGHT.
                 THE COURT: AND THERE ARE OTHER THINGS THAT MAY
 8
      FOLLOW, AND SO FORTH AND SO ON. BUT THAT WOULD BE THE EASIEST
 9
10
      CASE TO MAKE OUT FROM THE PLAINTIFFS' POINT OF VIEW.
11
                MR. STRIMLING: YES, YOUR HONOR. THAT ONE IS A
12
     WINNER.
13
                 THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T KNOW. I MEAN, LET'S TALK
     ABOUT THAT. IT SEEMED TO ME -- AND I WANTED TO SEE WHETHER I GOT
14
15
     THE ALLEGATIONS CORRECT IN THE COMPLAINT THAT -- LET ME APPROACH
16
     IT THIS WAY.
17
                 THE DEFENSE SAYS:
18
                       "LOOK, THERE WAS NO REPUDIATION OF THE
19
                 CONTRACT. AND THERE HAS TO BE THAT."
20
                 THEY SAY:
                      "THESE CONTRACT ARE VOIDABLE AND AT THE
21
22
                 DISCRETION OF THE ARTIST."
23
                 AND I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY RIGHT. BUT THEY SAY:
                      "VOIDABLE, AND IT HASN'T -- IT HASN'T -- THERE'S
24
25
                 BEEN NO ELECTION TO VOID IT."
```

1 AND THAT STRUCK ME AS A BIT ODD FOR A COUPLE OF 2 REASONS. NUMBER ONE IS I WOULD THINK THE FILING OF A LAWSUIT FOR 3 STARTERS IS NOTICE THAT YOU DO NOT INTEND TO HONOR THE TERMS OF 4 THE CONTRACT. 5 NUMBER TWO, EVEN BEFORE THE FILING OF THE LAWSUIT IF YOU NOTIFY THE COLLECTOR THAT YOU ARE WITHDRAWING THE 6 AUTHORIZATION TO COLLECT FUNDS, THAT IS ALSO A REPUDIATION OR AN 7 ATTEMPTED REPUDIATION OF A CONTRACT. 8 SO I LOOKED AT IT, AND I THOUGHT: 9 "ALL RIGHT. THOSE ARE TWO INDICATIONS THAT THE 10 11 CONTRACT WAS REPUDIATED." NOW, WHAT HAPPENED AFTER EITHER OF THOSE EVENTS? I 12 13 THINK WHAT HAPPENED AFTER EITHER OF THOSE EVENTS IS THAT 14 MONTEREY TOOK THE POSITION THAT THEY WERE OWED THE MONEY, AND 15 THEY TRIED TO COLLECT THE MONEY. AND THAT WOULD BE AN ARGUMENT 16 THAT THEY WERE SUPPORTING THE EXISTENCE OF A DEBT WHEN, IN FACT, 17 THE ARTISTS THEMSELVES WERE CANCELLING THE CONTRACT, WHICH WAS 18 THEIR RIGHT TO DO UNDER THE ARTISTS -- WHATEVER THAT ACT IS --19 TALENT ACT. 20 MR. STRIMLING: AFTSA, YES. 21 THE COURT: YES. SO I THOUGHT GIVEN THE EASY CASE 22 WHERE YOU'RE NOT LOOKING AT SECONDARY LIABILITY. YOU'RE JUST 23 SORT OF SITTING THERE SAYING: "OKAY. YOU CAN PROCEED AGAINST MONTEREY." 24 25 I THOUGHT, YEAH, I THINK YOU CAN PROCEED AGAINST

1 MONTEREY, AT LEAST AS TO THE SIMPLE CASE OR AS TO THE EASY CASE. 2 MR. STRIMLING: RIGHT. 3 THE COURT: AND THEN, I THOUGHT: "WELL, IF THAT'S TRUE, THEN WHY NOT JUST LET THE 4 5 CASE GO FORWARD? SEE HOW IT ALL COMES OUT IN THE WASH IN TERMS OF THE DISCOVERY, AND THEN SEE WHERE WE 6 7 ARE IN TERMS OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT?" MR. STRIMLING: YES, YOUR HONOR. I BELIEVE THAT'S 8 WISE, BECAUSE I THINK SUMMARY JUDGMENT WILL SHOW THAT THERE'S A 9 LOT OF EVIDENCE OF --10 11 THE COURT: I HAVE NO IDEA. THESE ARE NOW ALLEGATIONS. YOU KNOW, YOU TAKE A MOTION TO DISMISS AND YOU 12 13 DEAL WITH THE ALLEGATIONS. 14 MR. STRIMLING: RIGHT. 15 THE COURT: NOW, IT IS VERY DETAILED. THE COMPLAINT IS VERY DETAILED. AND WHETHER THE EVIDENCE WILL SUPPORT IT OR 16 17 NOT IS WHAT WE HAVE. THAT'S WHAT THE LAWSUIT IS ABOUT. 18 SO --19 MR. STRIMLING: YES, YOUR HONOR. 20 THE COURT: -- I THINK I SHOULD TALK TO MONTEREY COUNSEL AND FIND OUT WHAT THEY THINK IS WRONG WITH MY REASONING. 21 22 MR. ORR: SURE. SURE, YOUR HONOR. 23 I'M LOOKING IN THE COMPLAINT, AND I'M TRYING TO FIND 24 AN ALLEGATION IN WHICH THE PLAINTIFFS ALLEGE THAT MONTEREY 25 COLLECTED MONIES FROM THEM AFTER A REPUDIATION OF THE CONTRACT.

```
1
                 THE COURT: WELL, AFTER WHAT? I DON'T KNOW THAT IT
 2
      WOULD BE -- I THINK IT WOULD GO BEYOND JUST COLLECTING THE
 3
     MONEY. I THINK IT WOULD BE THE ATTEMPTED COLLECTION OF THE
 4
     MONEY UNDER THE ROSENTHAL ACT.
 5
                MR. STRIMLING: THEY ACTUALLY DID KEEP COLLECTING
     AND ACTUALLY RECEIVING FUNDS AFTER WE FILED THE LAWSUIT.
 6
 7
                MR. ORR: AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE
     INDIVIDUAL PLAINTIFFS. AND I DON'T SEE ANY ALLEGATION --
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: WELL, LET'S SEE WHERE WE ARE.
                MR. ORR: -- MONTEREY DID THAT AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL
10
11
     PLAINTIFFS IN THIS CASE.
12
                 THE COURT: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THE INDIVIDUAL
13
     PLAINTIFFS FOR A MINUTE.
14
                MR. ORR: SURE.
15
                 THE COURT: LET'S FIND THE PARAGRAPH.
16
                NOW, LOOKING AT -- HERE. OKAY. LOOK AT PARAGRAPH 37,
17
      OKAY?
18
                AND I'M REALLY FOCUSING ON LINE 13. IT SAYS:
19
                      "IN LATE JUNE OR EARLY JULY, 2009, TANNER
20
                 CANCELLED MONTEREY'S AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT FEES FROM
                 HIS BANK ACCOUNT. BEGINNING ON OR ABOUT JULY 6,
21
22
                MONTEREY BEGAN TO CALL TANNER AND HIS FAMILY
23
                 VERTICALLY DAILY TO DEMAND THAT HE CONTINUE TO PAY
                 UNDER HIS CONTRACT WITH BE."
24
25
                 WELL, ISN'T THAT A VIOLATION OF THE ROSENTHAL ACT?
```

Case3:09-cv-03770-CRB Document136 Filed03/18/11 Page8 of 18 1 I'M NOT SAYING --2 MR. ORR: RIGHT. YOUR HONOR, I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS. 3 THE COURT: YOU DO NOT? MR. ORR: I DO NOT. UNDER AFTSA, THE SPECIFIC 4 5 LANGUAGE SAYS THAT THESE CONTRACTS ARE VOIDABLE AT THE ELECTION OF THE ARTIST AGAINST THE ADVANCED FEE TALENT AGENCY. 6 7 NOW, MONTEREY, WHERE MONTEREY'S LIABILITY COMES IN, IF AT ALL, IS UNDER THE LENDER IN DUE COURSE LANGUAGE WITH THEIR 8 9 CONTRACTS WITH THE ARTISTS. SO WHETHER THE --THE COURT: WAIT. WITH THE ARTIST? YOU DON'T MEAN 10 11 WITH THE ARTIST. YOU MEAN WITH THE MANAGEMENT. I'M SORRY. I'M NOT FOLLOWING. 12 13 MR. ORR: WE HAVE FINANCING CONTRACTS WITH THE ARTISTS IN WHICH WE COLLECTED THESE FUNDS. AGAIN, THE HOLDER IN 14 15 DUE COURSE -- AS THIS COURT HAS PREVIOUSLY RULED, THE HOLDER IN DUE COURSE LANGUAGE UNDER THOSE CONTRACTS DID NOT ALLOW THESE 16 17 ARTISTS TO USE THAT LANGUAGE AS A SWORD TO TRY TO SEEK DAMAGES 18 FROM MONTEREY, BUT AS A SHIELD TO PROTECT AGAINST COLLECTIONS ON

HOWEVER, TRYING TO COLLECT UNDER THESE AMOUNTS I DON'T THINK IT CONSTITUTES ANY ILLEGALITY OR ANY UNLAWFUL CONDUCT, BECAUSE THE CONTRACTS ARE ONLY VOID, THE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTE IS AGAINST THE ADVANCE-FEE TALENT

THESE AMOUNTS. THAT'S UNDERSTOOD.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SERVICE.

SO THOSE CONTRACTS ARE NOT VOID AS TO MONTEREY.

```
1
                 THE COURT: IF THE -- WELL, IF THE ARTIST -- LET'S
 2
      SAY THE ARTIST, MR. TANNER, TANNER GOES TO BE, WHO IS -- LET'S
 3
      SAY THEY ARE STILL IN BUSINESS, WHICH THEY ARE NOT.
 4
                BUT HE GOES TO BE AND SAYS:
 5
                      "I CANCEL IT."
                 NOW, BE HAS ALREADY MADE ITS ARRANGEMENT WITH
 6
 7
     MONTEREY. OKAY. SO HE SAYS:
                      "I CANCEL IT. HERE. HERE'S A PIECE OF PAPER.
 8
 9
                 I CANCEL IT. IT'S UNEOUIVOCAL. I CANCEL IT."
                AND CAN MONTEREY, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT, CAN MONTEREY
10
11
     ATTEMPT TO COLLECT THE DEBT FROM TANNER?
                MR. STRIMLING: YOUR HONOR --
12
13
                 THE COURT: I'M ASKING -- I THINK I HAVE TO ASK
     MONTEREY THIS.
14
15
                MR. ORR: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S THE
     FACTS OF THIS CASE. I MEAN, THAT'S NOT OBVIOUSLY WHAT HAPPENED
16
17
     HERE. THERE WAS NOT A CANCELLATION OF THE CONTRACT.
                 THE COURT: WELL --
18
19
                MR. ORR: BUT ASSUMING YOUR HYPOTHETICAL --
20
                 THE COURT: YES.
                MR. ORR: -- I THINK MONTEREY COULD PROBABLY TRY TO
21
22
      COLLECT UNDER THAT CONTRACT. THE CONTRACT'S NOT VOID.
23
                 THE COURT: WELL, I GO TO MACY'S AND I BUY A
24
     REFRIGERATOR.
25
                MR. ORR: RIGHT.
```

```
1
                 THE COURT: AND THEY DELIVER THE REFRIGERATOR, AND
 2
      IT'S ALL FINANCED, RIGHT? AND MONTEREY IS HOLDING THE
 3
      COLLECTION --
 4
                MR. ORR: RIGHT.
 5
                 THE COURT: -- OF MY MACY'S DEBT. AND I GET THE
      REFRIGERATOR, AND I GO:
 6
                      "THIS IS NOT WHAT I WANT."
 7
                 I SEND IT BACK, AND I SAY:
 8
                      "I'M NOT BUYING IT."
 9
                 OKAY? PERIOD. END OF MY DEALINGS WITH MACY'S. AND
10
11
      THEN, MONTEREY COMES IN AND SAYS:
                      "YOU OWE MONEY FOR THE REFRIGERATOR."
12
13
                 MR. STRIMLING: YOUR HONOR?
                 THE COURT: I OWE MONEY ON THE CONTRACT.
14
15
                 MR. STRIMLING: THEY HAVE A DEFENSE THAT THEY CAN --
16
      IF THEY CAN REALLY VALIDATE THAT DEFENSE, THAT'S NOT A
17
      DISMISSAL.
18
                 THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. NO. NO. YOU HAVE A
19
      DEFENSE. YOU HAVE THE DEFENSE OF GOOD FAITH. IN OTHER WORDS, IF
20
      YOU WANT TO ARGUE THAT IN GOOD FAITH YOU BELIEVED THAT THE DEBT
      CONTINUED OR THE DEBT WAS A VALID DEBT, AND YOU WERE COLLECTING
21
22
      ON A VALID DEBT, THAT MAY BE -- THAT MAY BE THE CASE.
23
                 BUT THAT'S NOT THIS CASE AT THIS STAGE.
                 MR. STRIMLING: AT THIS STAGE.
24
25
                 THE COURT: THIS CASE AT THIS STAGE IS WHETHER OR NOT
```

THEY CAN SAY THAT YOU COULDN'T COLLECT ON THE DEBT BECAUSE THE

1

```
2
      DEBT WAS VOIDED, AMONG OTHER THINGS.
 3
                 AND I'M TAKING -- WHAT I AM TRYING TO DO IS TAKE THE
 4
      SIMPLE CASE RATHER THAN THE COMPLICATED CASE.
 5
                 MR. ORR: I UNDERSTAND THAT, YOUR HONOR, AND I
     APPRECIATE THAT.
 6
 7
                 AGAIN, THIS CASE IS THE ALLEGATIONS THAT'S SET FORTH
      IN THE COMPLAINT. AND THE ONLY ALLEGATION WE HAVE IS THAT --
 8
 9
      THE ONLY NOTICE WHATSOEVER THAT MONTEREY COULD HAVE POSSIBLY HAD
10
      THAT THESE CONTRACTS WERE VOIDABLE OR VOID OR ANYTHING ELSE IS
11
     THE FACT THAT WE'VE GOT A CLASS MEMBER, A NAMED PLAINTIFF,
12
      CANCELLING AUTHORIZATION FROM MONTEREY TO DEBIT THEIR ACCOUNT.
13
                 THE COURT: WELL, THAT'S A PRETTY GOOD EXAMPLE, ISN'T
     IT?
14
15
                MR. ORR: WELL, IT COULD BE AN EXAMPLE OF PLAINTIFF
16
     SAYING:
                      "I DON'T WANT TO PAY. I CAN'T AFFORD IT."
17
18
                 THE COURT: IT COULD.
19
                 MR. ORR: I WOULD THINK THERE HAS TO BE MORE IN THE
20
     ALLEGATIONS OF THE COMPLAINT THAN A SIMPLE:
                      "I CANCEL" --
21
22
                 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW, BECAUSE IF THE PERSON -- I
23
     DON'T KNOW, BECAUSE IF THE PERSON HAS THE RIGHT TO CANCEL, I
24
     MEAN, YOU COULD SAY:
25
                      "YOU DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO CANCEL. THEY
```

1 DIDN'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO CANCEL." 2 BUT WHAT YOU CAN'T SAY IS: 3 "THEY DIDN'T CANCEL IT." AND THAT'S A DIFFERENT 4 THING. THEY MAY NOT HAVE HAD THE RIGHT TO CANCEL, BUT YOU CAN 5 ARGUE THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO CANCEL. BUT IT'S NOT CLEAR, AND I HAVE TO HAND IT TO THE PLAINTIFFS. I MEAN, I THINK THE 6 SECOND-AMENDED COMPLAINT THEY ARE AS CLEAR AS THEY CAN BE, OR 7 APPEAR TO BE RELATIVELY CLEAR IN TERMS OF THEIR ALLEGATIONS. 8 9 LOOK, I'M NOT SAYING YOU DON'T HAVE A GOOD FAITH 10 DEFENSE. I'M NOT SAYING THAT THE EVIDENCE WON'T COME OUT YOUR 11 WAY AND SO FORTH AND SO ON, BECAUSE I HAVE NO IDEA. BUT WE'RE AT A MOTION TO DISMISS. AND IT SEEMS TO ME 12 13 THERE'S ENOUGH HERE, YOU KNOW, TAKING THE SIMPLE CASE. THE 14 COMPLICATED CASE, I DON'T KNOW. I DON'T KNOW, BECAUSE I DON'T 15 KNOW ENOUGH REALLY ABOUT THE SO-CALLED INTERRELATIONSHIPS AND 16 EVIDENCE BACK AND FORTH ON ALL OF THESE OTHER THINGS. 17 AND I THOUGHT RATHER THAN TRY TO SWIM THROUGH IT, SINCE THE CASE IS GOING TO BE ALIVE WHEN YOU WALK OUT OF HERE, 18 19 LET YOU GUYS SWIM THROUGH IT. AND THEN, YOU COME IN WITH YOUR SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTIONS, AND THEY WILL EITHER BE -- YOU'RE 20 EITHER RIGHT OR WRONG AS A MATTER OF LAW. 21 22 THERE EITHER ARE GOING TO BE OR NOT FACTUAL DISPUTES, 23 BUT MAYBE THERE WON'T BE ON A NUMBER OF THINGS. YOU KNOW? MR. STRIMLING: RIGHT, YOUR HONOR. 24 25 THE COURT: AND I THINK PROBABLY, IN PART, JUST TO

1 SORT OF DIFFUSE THE SITUATION, SURE I'VE LOOKED AT THIS A NUMBER 2 OF TIMES, AND I'VE GIVEN SOME OPINIONS AND SO FORTH. 3 BUT WHAT I ALWAYS -- ALMOST ALWAYS -- NOT ALWAYS, BUT 4 ALMOST ALWAYS DO IS ALLOW A PARTY TO FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT 5 WITHOUT PASSING ON THE MERITS OF THE COMPLAINT IN THE DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE PERMITTED TO FILE, YOU KNOW. 6 BECAUSE IT ALWAYS STRUCK ME THAT THAT'S LIKE A TWO-STEP PROCESS 7 WHERE YOU DON'T NEED BOTH STEPS. 8 9 IT'S SORT OF -- SO NOTWITHSTANDING WHATEVER YOU WANT TO READ INTO WHAT I'VE DONE BEFORE, I REALLY THINK THAT IT'S 10 11 BEFORE ME IN THE RIGHT POSTURE. AND LOOKING AT IT, I THINK THAT IT GOES FORWARD. 12 13 MR. STRIMLING: I UNDERSTAND THAT, YOUR HONOR. WE TRIED TO BE MORE SPECIFIC, YOUR HONOR, YES. 14 15 MR. ORR: JUST TO MAKE ONE LAST ARGUMENT ON MY WAY 16 OUT OF DOOR, YOUR HONOR, JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT I'M HEARD -- AND 17 MAYBE THIS IS FOR THE RECORD -- AGAIN, I THINK OUR POSITION IS THAT EVEN IF THESE UNDERLYING CONTRACTS WERE UNENFORCEABLE AND 18 19 VOID AS TO THE ADVANCED FEE SERVICE, ADVANCE-TALENT FEE SERVICE, WHICH IS WHAT THE CONTRACT SAYS, MONTEREY COULD STILL TRY TO 20 COLLECT ON THOSE CONTRACTS. 21 22 IT WOULDN'T BE A VIOLATION OF THE ROSENTHAL ACT OR 23 ANY OTHER ACTS. WHAT THE ARTIST COULD SAY IS IS THAT: "HEY, THE HOLDER IN DUE COURSE LANGUAGE IN YOUR 24

CONTRACT ALLOWS ME TO USE THE SAME DEFENSES THAT I

25

```
1
                 USED WITH RESPECT TO BE IN YOUR EFFORTS TO COLLECT
 2
                 AGAINST THIS CONTRACT."
 3
                 SO MONTEREY -- AGAIN, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT MONTEREY
      WOULD VIOLATE, EVEN IF -- AND THIS IS NOT WHAT THE FACTS REFLECT
 4
 5
      OR ANYTHING AT ALL. THIS IS PLEADING STAGE HERE. BUT EVEN IF
      PLAINTIFFS ALLEGE THAT MONTEREY HAD ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE THAT THE
 6
 7
      PLAINTIFFS IN THIS CASE --
                THE COURT: SO --
 8
 9
                MR. ORR: -- VOID CONTRACTS, MONTEREY COULD STILL TRY
10
     TO COLLECT.
11
                 THE COURT: REALLY?
                MR. ORR: THEY COULD THEN USE THAT.
12
13
                 THE COURT: SO EXPLAIN THIS TO ME. I GO TO MACY'S.
14
      I BUY MY REFRIGERATOR. I DON'T LIKE MY REFRIGERATOR. I TURN
15
     AROUND AND RETURN IT WITHIN THE SPECIFIED PERIOD OF TIME, AND
16
     YOU HOLD THE PAPER. I OWE YOU THE MONEY?
17
                MR. ORR: NO, YOU DON'T. BUT WHAT YOU WOULD DO IS
     YOU WOULD THEN ASSERT THAT AS A DEFENSE.
18
19
                 WHAT I'M SAYING IS IF THE FINANCE COMPANY WERE
20
     ATTEMPTING TO COLLECT ON THAT, THAT WOULD NOT BE A VIOLATION OF
     ROSENTHAL OR UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW. THEY ARE STILL COLLECTING
21
22
      ON A DEBT THAT AS TO THEM IS A VALID DEBT.
23
                 NOW, AS TO, YOU KNOW, MACY'S OR SEARS, OR WHOEVER
24
     ELSE, THAT MAY BE A VOIDABLE OR A VOID DEBT. WHAT THE CONSUMER
25
     WOULD THEN SAY IS:
```

```
1
                      "HEY, IN THIS CONTRACT IT SAYS THAT I CAN ASSERT
 2
                 ALL THE DEFENSES I HAVE WITH MACY'S AGAINST
 3
                 MONTEREY."
                 AND THAT'S WHAT WOULD HAPPEN HERE. MONTEREY DID NOT
 4
 5
      COLLECT ANY MONEY FROM A SINGLE -- AS FAR AS I UNDERSTAND -- A
      SINGLE INDIVIDUAL WHO REPUDIATED OR CANCELLED THEIR CONTRACT.
 6
                 IF THEY TRY TO COLLECT -- AGAIN, I DON'T THINK THAT'S
 7
      A VIOLATION OF ROSENTHAL. I DON'T THINK IT VIOLATES AN UNFAIR
 8
      COMPETITION LAW, BECAUSE THAT CONTRACT PURSUANT TO THE STATUTE,
 9
10
      AFTSA, IS ONLY VOIDABLE AT THE ELECTION OF THE ARTIST. AND IT
11
      SPECIFICALLY SAYS:
12
                      "SHALL NOT BE ENFORCEABLE BY THE ADVANCE-FEE
13
                 TALENT SERVICE."
                 AGAIN, MONTEREY --THIS COURT HAS ALREADY HELD THAT
14
15
     MONTEREY IS NOT AN ADVANCE-FEE TALENT SERVICE. THEY ALSO SAID
16
      THERE'S NO SECONDARY LIABILITY.
17
                 SO MONTEREY'S LIMITED IN THEIR -- THE WAY THAT THEY
18
      ARE NOT ABLE TO GO AND COLLECT ON A DEBT THAT, YOU KNOW, IS NOT
19
      OWED AS TO THE TALENT SERVICE IS THAT THESE CONSUMERS CAN SAY:
20
                      "HEY, HOLDER IN DUE COURSE, YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED
                 TO COLLECT THAT DEBT."
21
22
                 I CAN USE THESE SAME DEFENSES AGAINST MONTEREY.
23
                 I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT POINT CLEAR, YOUR HONOR.
                 THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHETHER YOU ARE RIGHT.
24
25
     YOU MIGHT BE RIGHT. BUT BE THAT AS IT MAY, I THINK I WANT TO
```

```
1
      LET THE CASE GO FORWARD AT THIS POINT, BECAUSE NOW THAT YOU SORT
 2
      OF DEALT WITH THE SIMPLE CASE, THE MORE COMPLICATED CASE IS THAT
 3
      YOU WERE, QUOTE, "PART AND PARCEL IN WITH THEM," RIGHT? AND
 4
      THAT'S -- YOU KNOW, WE WILL WAIT AND SEE WHETHER THAT'S THE
 5
      CASE.
                MR. ORR: UNDERSTOOD, YOUR HONOR.
 6
                 MR. STRIMLING: AND, YOUR HONOR, THEY WERE
 7
      THREATENING PEOPLE'S CREDIT. THEY WERE REPORTING PEOPLE TO
 8
      CREDIT AGENCIES. IT'S NOT LIKE THEY DESISTED. AND THEY DID
 9
     KEEP COLLECTING AGAINST CLASS MEMBERS SO --
10
11
                 THE COURT: WELL, I DON'T -- ANYWAY, IT'S ENOUGH
     TO -- THE MOTION TO DISMISS IS DENIED.
12
13
                 AND HOW DO YOU WANT TO PROCEED? I MEAN, YOU ARE
      GOING TO DO DISCOVERY. HAVE YOU AGREED ON DISCOVERY?
14
15
                 MR. ORR: WE'VE GOT A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
     DATE THIS COURT SET PREVIOUSLY. I THINK THAT WE MAY REVISIT
16
17
      THAT. I'M NOT SURE IN TERMS OF THE TIMING. BUT WE HAVE NOT --
      WE'VE KIND OF HELD DISCOVERY IN ABEYANCE TO KIND OF SEE,
18
19
      OBVIOUSLY, IF THIS CASE WAS GOING TO PROCEED.
20
                 WE WILL MEET AND CONFER ON IT. WE HAVE HAD A PRETTY
      GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL. WE WILL MEET AND
21
22
      CONFER, MOVE FORWARD WITH THE DISCOVERY. AND THEN, EITHER FILE
23
     A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR GET A CLASS CERTIFICATION
24
     MOTION ON CALENDAR.
```

THE COURT: OKAY. SO WHY DON'T YOU COME BACK HERE IN

25

```
1
      90 DAYS OR SO AND TELL ME WHAT YOU'RE DOING.
 2
                 MR. STRIMLING: OKAY. YOU WANT TO SET A DATE?
 3
                 THE COURT: FOR A STATUS CONFERENCE.
 4
                 MR. STRIMLING: SURE.
 5
                 THE CLERK: MAY 27.
                 MR. PRESTON (BY PHONE): YOUR HONOR?
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: YES.
                MR. PRESTON (BY PHONE): DOES YOUR HONOR INTEND TO
 8
      ISSUE KIND OF A FULL WRITTEN OPINION?
 9
                 THE COURT: NO, YOU'VE HEARD THE FULL WRITTEN
10
11
     OPINION. THAT'S IT.
                MR. PRESTON (BY PHONE): VERY GOOD, YOUR HONOR.
12
                 THE COURT: IT'S A MOTION TO DISMISS. I DON'T WRITE
13
14
      OPINIONS ON NONDISPOSITIVE ORDERS. OKAY.
15
                MR. STRIMLING: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR HONOR.
16
                MR. ORR: SAME TIME ON MAY 27?
17
                 MR. STRIMLING: WHAT TIME?
18
                 THE CLERK: 8:30.
19
                MR. STRIMLING: 8:30.
20
                 MR. ORR: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
                 THE COURT: AND IF YOU WANT CO-COUNSEL TO APPEAR BY
21
22
     TELEPHONE, THAT'S FINE.
23
                MR. STRIMLING: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR
24
     HONOR.
25
                 THE COURT: OKAY. THANKS.
```

1	MR. ORR: THANK YOU.
2	MR. PRESTON (BY PHONE): THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
3	(THEREUPON, THIS HEARING WAS CONCLUDED.)
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
5	I, KATHERINE WYATT, THE UNDERSIGNED, HEREBY CERTIFY
6	THAT THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS WERE REPORTED BY ME, A CERTIFIED
7	SHORTHAND REPORTER, AND WERE THEREAFTER TRANSCRIBED BY ME INTO
8	TYPEWRITING; THAT THE FOREGOING IS A FULL, COMPLETE AND TRUE
9	RECORD OF SAID PROCEEDINGS.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NOT OF COUNSEL OR
11	ATTORNEY FOR EITHER OR ANY OF THE PARTIES IN THE FOREGOING
12	PROCEEDINGS AND CAPTION NAMED, OR IN ANY WAY INTERESTED IN THE
13	OUTCOME OF THE CAUSE NAMED IN SAID CAPTION.
14	THE FEE CHARGED AND THE PAGE FORMAT FOR THE
15	TRANSCRIPT CONFORM TO THE REGULATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL
16	CONFERENCE.
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SET MY HAND THIS
18	18H DAY OF MARCH, 2011.
19	
20	
21	/S/ KATHERINE WYATT
22	
23	
24	
25	